

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
9 CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

10 DAVID UPTON,) No. ED CV 08-1497-ABC (PJW)
11)
12 Petitioner,) ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE WHY PETITION
13 v.) SHOULD NOT BE DISMISSED
14)
15 DIRECTOR OF CORRECTIONS,)
Respondent.)

16 On October 24, 2008, Petitioner filed a Petition for Writ of
17 Habeas Corpus ("Petition"), seeking to challenge the lawfulness of a
18 parole revocation proceeding. According to the Petition, he was
19 convicted of being a felon in possession of a loaded firearm in
20 January 2006 and sentenced to four years in custody.¹ (Petition at
21 2.) Thereafter, he was released on parole and, in September 2008, his
22 parole was revoked, resulting in a five-month sentence, which he is
23 currently serving. (Petition at 3-4.) In the Petition, he claims
24 that the September 2008 revocation proceedings violated his
25 constitutional rights. (Petition at 3-6.)
26
27

28 ¹ Petitioner has filed a separate habeas petition challenging
the underlying convictions, which is still pending before the Court.
(See *Upton v. State of California*, CV 07-1067-ABC (PJW).)

1 As a matter of comity between state and federal courts, a federal
2 court generally will not address the merits of a habeas corpus
3 petition unless the petitioner has first exhausted his state remedies,
4 i.e., sought state court review of every ground presented in the
5 petition by presenting it to the highest state court. *Rose v. Lundy*,
6 455 U.S. 509, 518-22 (1982). Indeed, the law governing habeas
7 petitions provides that a habeas petition brought by a person in state
8 custody *cannot be granted* "unless it appears that--(A) the applicant
9 has exhausted the remedies available in the courts of the State; or
10 (B)(I) there is an absence of available State corrective process; or
11 (ii) circumstances exist that render such process ineffective to
12 protect the rights of the applicant." 28 U.S.C. § 2254(b)(1). To
13 exhaust state remedies, a petitioner must fairly present his
14 contentions to the state courts, and the highest court of the state
15 must dispose of them on the merits. *O'Sullivan v. Boerckel*, 526 U.S.
16 838, 842, 844-45 (1999). A district court may raise a failure to
17 exhaust *sua sponte*. *Stone v. San Francisco*, 968 F.2d 850, 856 (9th
18 Cir. 1992.)

19 In his Petition, Petitioner does not allege that he has presented
20 any of his grounds for relief to the California Supreme Court. Thus,
21 it appears that the Petition is completely unexhausted and is subject
22 to dismissal on that basis. See *Rasberry v. Garcia*, 448 F.3d 1150,
23 1154 (9th Cir. 2006).

24 IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that, no later than December 1, 2008,
25 Petitioner shall inform the Court in writing why this case should not
26
27
28

1 be dismissed for failure to exhaust. Failure to timely file a
2 response will result in a recommendation that this case be dismissed.

3
4 DATED: October 30, 2008.

5 
6

7

PATRICK J. WALSH
8 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

26 S:\PJW\Cases-State Habeas\UPTON, D 1497\OSC dismiss pet.wpd
27
28